UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/902,421	07/10/2001	Venkateswarlu Kolluri	10984-540001 / P258	7671

26161   7590   08/25/2005

FISH & RICHARDSON PC
P.O. BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER
BHATIA, AJAY M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2145	

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/902,421	KOLLURI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ajay M. Bhatia	2145	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _6/13/2005_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-36_ is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-36_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)   5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .   6)☐ Other: _____ .

Specification

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly

indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 29-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is

directed to non-statutory subject matter. Rejected claim(s) do not clearly define the

claimed invention as a tangible embodiment therefore claim(s) are non-statutory. MPEP

§ 2105, states that an article of manufacture must be made from raw materials.

Applicant may include the limitation "contained on a tangible embodied computer

readable medium" to over come this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an

international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-8, 10-12, 14-20, 22-24, and 26-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kleinberg U.S. Patent 6,112,202.

For claim 1, Kleinberg teaches, an inferred relation weighting process for determining the strength of an inferred relation between a first and a second Internet object, which are not directly linked, comprising:

a first link weighting process for determining the strength of at least a first link between said first non-directly linked Internet object and a common object; (see Kleinberg, figures 1-5, Col. 2 line 58 to Col. 3 line 4, Col. 3 lines 47-54, Col. 4 lines 24-33, Col. 4 line 65 to Col. 5 line 3, Col. 6 lines 21-29, Col. 6 lines 30-38, Col. 8 line 44 to Col. 9 line 28)

a second link weighting process for determining the strength of at least a second link between said second non-directly linked Internet object and said common object; (see Kleinberg, figures 1-5, Col. 2 line 58 to Col. 3 line 4, Col. 3 lines 47-54, Col. 4 lines 24-33, Col. 4 line 65 to Col. 5 line 3, Col. 6 lines 21-29, Col. 6 lines 30-38, Col. 8 line 44 to Col. 9 line 28)

and an inferred relation weight calculation process for calculating the strength of said inferred relation based on the strength of said at least a first link and said at least a second link. (see Kleinberg, Col. 6 lines 55-64, Col. 9 lines 37-43, Col. 10 lines 6-Col. 4 lines 53-65, Col. 10 lines 41-46, Col. 10 lines 65-67, Col. Col. 4 lines 34-43 lines Col. 4 lines 53-65-Col. 6 lines 21-29)

For claim 2, Kleinberg teaches, the inferred relation weighting process of claim 1

wherein said common object comprises a plurality of discrete Internet objects, each

interconnected with a discrete link, and said plurality of discrete Internet objects and

links connect said first and second links, wherein said inferred relation weighting

process further comprises an intermediate link weighting process for determining the

strength of each said discrete link, wherein the strength of said inferred relation is based

on the strength of each said discrete link and the strength of said at least a first link and

said at least a second link. (see Kleinberg, figures 1-5, Col. 2 line 58 to Col. 3 line 4,

Col. 3 lines 47-54, Col. 4 lines 24-33, Col. 6 lines 21-29, Col. 6 lines 30-38, Col. 6 lines

55-64, Col. 9 lines 37-43, Col. 10 lines 6-Col. 4 lines 53-65, Col. 10 lines 41-46, Col. 10

lines 65-67, Col. Col. 4 lines 34-43 lines Col. 4 lines 53-65-Col. 6 lines 21-29)

For claim 3, Kleinberg teaches, the inferred relation weighting process of claim 1

wherein said common object includes at least one Internet query. (see Kleinberg, Col. 4

lines 34-43)

For claim 4, Kleinberg teaches, the inferred relation weighting process of claim 1

wherein said common object includes at least one Internet document. (see Kleinberg,

Col. 5 lines 60-63, Col. 6 lines 10-20, Col. 6 lines 21-29)

For claim 5, Kleinberg teaches, the inferred relation weighting process of claim 2 further comprising a link limitation process for specifying a link limit concerning the maximum number of links allowed to connect said first and second non-directly linked Internet objects. (see Kleinberg, Col. 8 lines 25-27)

For claim 6, Kleinberg teaches, the inferred relation weighting process of claim 2 further comprising an incoming link analysis process for determining the number of objects linked to each of said plurality of Internet objects, wherein the incoming link value of each said Internet object is directly proportional to the number of objects linked to that Internet object. (see Kleinberg, figures 1-5, Col. 4 lines 24-33, Col. 4 lines 53-65, Col. 6 lines 10-20, Col. 6 lines 21-29)

For claim 7, Kleinberg teaches, the inferred relation weighting process of claim 2 further comprising an outgoing link analysis process for determining the number of objects that each of said plurality of Internet objects is linked to, wherein the outgoing link value of each said Internet object is directly proportional to the number of objects that said Internet object is linked to. (see Kleinberg, figures 1-5, Col. 4 lines 24-33, Col. 6 lines 30-38, Col. 7 lines 16-20)

For claim 8, Kleinberg teaches, the inferred relation weighting process of claim 2 wherein said inferred relation weight calculation process includes a known relation recalculation process for redefining the values of the strength of each said discrete link

and the strength of said at least a first link and said at least a second link in response to the calculation of said strength of said inferred relation. (see Kleinberg, figures 1-5, Col. 3 lines 47-54, Col. 4 lines 24-33, Col. 4 lines 53-65, 24, Col. 10 lines 41-46, Col. 10 lines 65-67, Col. 10 lines 6-Col. 4 lines 53-65)

For claim 10, Kleinberg teaches, the inferred relation weighting process of claim 1 wherein at least one of said Internet objects is an Internet query. (see Kleinberg, Col. 4 lines 34-43)

For claim 11, Kleinberg teaches, the inferred relation weighting process of claim 1 wherein at least one of said Internet objects is an Internet document. (see Kleinberg, Col. 7 lines 33-38)

For claim 12, Kleinberg teaches, the inferred relation weighting process of claim 1 wherein said strength of said inferred relation is a relevance score. (see Kleinberg, Col. 4 lines 53-65)

For claim 14, Kleinberg teaches, an inferred relation weighting process for determining the strength of an inferred relation between a first and a second Internet object, which are not directly linked, comprising:

a first link weighting process for determining the strength of at least a first link between said first non-directly linked Internet object and a plurality of common objects;

(see Kleinberg, figures 1-7, Col. 2 line 58 to Col. 3 line 4, Col. 3 lines 47-54, Col. 4 lines

24-33, Col. 4 line 65 to Col. 5 line 3, Col. 6 lines 21-29, Col. 6 lines 30-38, Col. 8 line 44

to Col. 9 line 28)

a second link weighting process for determining the strength of at least a second

link between said second non-directly linked Internet object and said plurality of

common objects; wherein said plurality of common objects comprises a first common

object connected to said first link; a second common object connected to said second

link, and an intermediate link interconnecting said first and second common objects;

(see Kleinberg, figures 1-7, Col. 2 line 58 to Col. 3 line 4, Col. 3 lines 47-54, Col. 4 lines

24-33, Col. 4 line 65 to Col. 5 line 3, Col. 6 lines 21-29, Col. 6 lines 30-38, Col. 8 line 44

to Col. 9 line 28)

an intermediate link weighting process for determining the strength of said

intermediate link; (see Kleinberg, figures 1-7, Col. 2 line 58 to Col. 3 line 4, Col. 3 lines

47-54, Col. 4 lines 24-33, Col. 4 line 65 to Col. 5 line 3, Col. 6 lines 21-29, Col. 6 lines

30-38, Col. 8 line 44 to Col. 9 line 28)

and an inferred relation weight calculation process for calculating the strength of

said inferred relation based on the strength of said at least a first link, said at least a

second link, and said intermediate link. (see Kleinberg, Col. 6 lines 55-64, Col. 9 lines

37-43, Col. 10 lines 6-Col. 4 lines 53-65, Col. 10 lines 41-46, Col. 10 lines 65-67, Col.

Col. 4 lines 34-43 lines Col. 4 lines 53-65-Col. 6 lines 21-29)

For claim 15, Kleinberg teaches, the inferred relation weighting process of claim 14 further comprising a link limitation process for specifying a link limit concerning the maximum number of links allowed to connect said first and second non-directly linked Internet objects. (see Kleinberg, Col. 8 lines 25-27)

For claim 16, Kleinberg teaches, the inferred relation weighting process of claim 14 wherein said plurality of common objects includes at least one Internet document. (see Kleinberg, Col. 5 lines 60-63, Col. 6 lines 10-20, Col. 6 lines 21-29)

For claim 17, Kleinberg teaches, the inferred relation weighting process of claim 14 wherein said intermediate link comprises at least one additional common object and a plurality of sub-links for connecting said at least one additional common object to said first and second common objects, wherein said intermediate link weighting process determines the strength of said intermediate link based on the individual strengths of said sub-links. (see Kleinberg, figures 1-7, Col. 4 line 65 to Col. 5 line 3, Col. 8 line 44 to Col. 9 line 28, Col. 10 lines 6-Col. 4 lines 53-65, Col. 10 lines 65-67, Col. Col. 4 lines 34-43 lines Col. 4 lines 53-65-Col. 6 lines 21-29)

For claim 18, Kleinberg teaches, the inferred relation weighting process of claim 17 further comprising an incoming link analysis process for determining the number of objects linked to each of said plurality of Internet objects and each said common object, wherein the incoming link value of each said Internet object and each said common

object is directly proportional to the number of objects linked to that object. (see

Kleinberg, figures 1-7, Col. 4 line 65 to Col. 5 line 3, Col. 8 line 44 to Col. 9 line 28, Col.

10 lines 6-Col. 4 lines 53-65, Col. 10 lines 65-67, Col. Col. 4 lines 34-43 lines Col. 4

lines 53-65-Col. 6 lines 21-29)

For claim 19, Kleinberg teaches, the inferred relation weighting process of claim

17 further comprising an outgoing link analysis process for determining the number of

objects that each of said plurality of Internet objects and each said common object is

linked to, wherein the outgoing link value of each said Internet object and each said

common object is directly proportional to the number of objects that said object is linked

to. (see Kleinberg, figures 1-7, Col. 4 line 65 to Col. 5 line 3, Col. 8 line 44 to Col. 9 line

28, Col. 10 lines 6-Col. 4 lines 53-65, Col. 10 lines 65-67, Col. Col. 4 lines 34-43 lines

Col. 4 lines 53-65-Col. 6 lines 21-29)

For claim 20, Kleinberg teaches, the inferred relation weighting process of claim

17 wherein said inferred relation weight calculation process includes a known relation

recalculation process for redefining the values of the strength of each said sub-link and

the strength of said at least a first link and said at least a second link in response to the

calculation of said strength of said inferred relation. (see Kleinberg, figures 1-7, Col. 4

line 65 to Col. 5 line 3, Col. 8 line 44 to Col. 9 line 28, Col. 10 lines 6-Col. 4 lines 53-65,

Col. 10 lines 65-67, Col. Col. 4 lines 34-43 lines Col. 4 lines 53-65-Col. 6 lines 21-29)

For claim 22, Kleinberg teaches, the inferred relation weighting process of claim 14 wherein at least one of said Internet objects is an Internet query. (see Kleinberg, Col. 4 lines 34-43)

For claim 23, Kleinberg teaches, the inferred relation weighting process of claim 14 wherein at least one of said Internet objects is an Internet document. (see Kleinberg, Col. 7 lines 33-38)

For claim 24, Kleinberg teaches, the inferred relation weighting process of claim 14 wherein said strength of said inferred relation is a relevance score. (see Kleinberg, Col. 4 lines 53-65)

For claim 26, Kleinberg teaches, a method for determining the strength of an inferred relation between a first and a second Internet object, which are not directly linked, comprising:

determining the strength of at least a first link between the first non-directly linked Internet object and a common object; (see Kleinberg, figures 1-5, Col. 2 line 58 to Col. 3 line 4, Col. 3 lines 47-54, Col. 4 lines 24-33, Col. 4 line 65 to Col. 5 line 3, Col. 6 lines 21-29, Col. 6 lines 30-38, Col. 8 line 44 to Col. 9 line 28)

determining the strength of at least a second link between the second non-directly linked Internet object and the common object; (see Kleinberg, figures 1-5, Col. 2

line 58 to Col. 3 line 4, Col. 3 lines 47-54, Col. 4 lines 24-33, Col. 4 line 65 to Col. 5 line

3, Col. 6 lines 21-29, Col. 6 lines 30-38, Col. 8 line 44 to Col. 9 line 28)

and calculating the strength of the inferred relation based on the strength of the

at least a first link and the at least a second link. (see Kleinberg, Col. 6 lines 55-64, Col.

9 lines 37-43, Col. 10 lines 6-Col. 4 lines 53-65, Col. 10 lines 41-46, Col. 10 lines 65-67,

Col. Col. 4 lines 34-43 lines Col. 4 lines 53-65-Col. 6 lines 21-29)

For claim 27, Kleinberg teaches, the method for determining the strength of an

inferred relation of claim 26 wherein the common object comprises a plurality of discrete

Internet objects, each interconnected with a discrete link, and the plurality of discrete

Internet objects and links connect the first and second links, wherein determining the

strength of the inferred relation further comprises determining the strength of each

discrete link, wherein the strength of the inferred relation is based on the strength of

each discrete link and the strength of the at least a first link and the at least a second

link. (see Kleinberg, figures 1-5, Col. 2 line 58 to Col. 3 line 4, Col. 3 lines 47-54, Col. 4

lines 24-33, Col. 6 lines 21-29, Col. 6 lines 30-38, Col. 6 lines 55-64, Col. 9 lines 37-43,

Col. 10 lines 6-Col. 4 lines 53-65, Col. 10 lines 41-46, Col. 10 lines 65-67, Col. Col. 4

lines 34-43 lines Col. 4 lines 53-65-Col. 6 lines 21-29)

For claim 28, Kleinberg teaches, the method for determining the strength of an

inferred relation of claim 27 further comprising specifying a link limit concerning the

maximum number of links allowed to connect the first and second non-directly linked

Internet objects. (see Kleinberg, Col. 8 lines 25-27)

For claim 29, Kleinberg teaches, a computer program product residing on a

computer readable medium having a plurality of instructions stored thereon which, when

executed by the processor, cause that processor to:

determine the strength of at least a first link between the first non-directly linked

Internet object and a common object; (see Kleinberg, figures 1-5, Col. 2 line 58 to Col.

3 line 4, Col. 3 lines 47-54, Col. 4 lines 24-33, Col. 4 line 65 to Col. 5 line 3, Col. 6 lines

21-29, Col. 6 lines 30-38, Col. 8 line 44 to Col. 9 line 28)

determine the strength of at least a second link between the second non-directly

linked Internet object and the common object; (see Kleinberg, figures 1-5, Col. 2 line 58

to Col. 3 line 4, Col. 3 lines 47-54, Col. 4 lines 24-33, Col. 4 line 65 to Col. 5 line 3, Col.

6 lines 21-29, Col. 6 lines 30-38, Col. 8 line 44 to Col. 9 line 28)

and calculate the strength of the inferred relation based on the strength of the at

least a first link and the at least a second link. (see Kleinberg, Col. 6 lines 55-64, Col. 9

lines 37-43, Col. 10 lines 6-Col. 4 lines 53-65, Col. 10 lines 41-46, Col. 10 lines 65-67,

Col. Col. 4 lines 34-43 lines Col. 4 lines 53-65-Col. 6 lines 21-29)

For claim 30, Kleinberg teaches, the computer program product of claim 29

wherein said computer readable medium is a random access memory (RAM). (see

Kleinberg, Col. 12 lines 1-27)

For claim 31, Kleinberg teaches, the computer program product of claim 29 wherein said computer readable medium is a read only memory (ROM). (see Kleinberg, Col. 12 lines 1-27)

For claim 32, Kleinberg teaches, the computer program product of claim 29 wherein said computer readable medium is a hard disk drive. (see Kleinberg, Col. 12 lines 1-27)

For claim 33, Kleinberg teaches, a processor and memory configured to:

determine the strength of at least a first link between the first non-directly linked Internet object and a common object; (see Kleinberg, figures 1-5, Col. 2 line 58 to Col. 3 line 4, Col. 3 lines 47-54, Col. 4 lines 24-33, Col. 4 line 65 to Col. 5 line 3, Col. 6 lines 21-29, Col. 6 lines 30-38, Col. 8 line 44 to Col. 9 line 28 and Col. 12 lines 1-27)

determine the strength of at least a second link between the second non-directly linked Internet object and the common object; (see Kleinberg, figures 1-5, Col. 2 line 58 to Col. 3 line 4, Col. 3 lines 47-54, Col. 4 lines 24-33, Col. 4 line 65 to Col. 5 line 3, Col. 6 lines 21-29, Col. 6 lines 30-38, Col. 8 line 44 to Col. 9 line 28 and Col. 12 lines 1-27)

and calculate the strength of the inferred relation based on the strength of the at least a first link and the at least a second link. (see Kleinberg, Col. 6 lines 55-64, Col. 9 lines 37-43, Col. 10 lines 6-Col. 4 lines 53-65, Col. 10 lines 41-46, Col. 10 lines 65-67, Col. Col. 4 lines 34-43 lines Col. 4 lines 53-65-Col. 6 lines 21-29 and Col. 12 lines 1-27)

For claim 34, Kleinberg teaches, the processor and memory of claim 33 wherein said processor and memory are incorporated into a personal computer. (see Kleinberg, Col. 12 lines 1-27)

For claim 35, Kleinberg teaches, the processor and memory of claim 33 wherein said processor and memory are incorporated into a network server. (see Kleinberg, Col. 12 lines 1-27)

For claim 36, Kleinberg teaches, the processor and memory of claim 33 wherein said processor and memory are incorporated into a single board computer. (see Kleinberg, Col. 12 lines 1-27)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9, 13, 21, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Kleinberg U.S. Patent 6,112,202.

For claim 9, Kleinberg teaches, the inferred relation weighting process of claim 1 wherein at least one of said Internet objects. (see Kleinberg, figures 1-5, Col. 2 line 58 to Col. 3 line 4, Col. 3 lines 47-54, Col. 4 lines 24-33, Col. 4 line 65 to Col. 5 line 3, Col. 6 lines 21-29, Col. 6 lines 30-38, Col. 8 line 44 to Col. 9 line 28)

Kleinberg fail to clearly disclose, Internet objects is a transaction record.

It would have been obvious to on of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the method of searching using link object and the search of ecommerce data in order because it is well know in the art to search for items based on a price or linked to other items. (see Kleinberg, Col. 5 lines 20-25)

For claim 13, Kleinberg teaches, the inferred relation weighting process of claim 9 wherein said relevance score. (see Kleinberg, figures 1-5, Col. 2 line 58 to Col. 3 line 4, Col. 3 lines 47-54, Col. 4 lines 24-33, Col. 4 line 65 to Col. 5 line 3, Col. 6 lines 21-29, Col. 6 lines 30-38, Col. 8 line 44 to Col. 9 line 28)

Kleinberg fail to clearly disclose, relevance score is a percentage

It would have been obvious to on of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to represent the mathematical value of Kleinberg in the form of a percentage in order to represent the score in a manner familiar to the user. Official notice it taken.

For claim 21, Kleinberg teaches, the inferred relation weighting process of claim 14 wherein at least one of said Internet objects is a transaction record. (see Kleinberg, figures 1-5, Col. 2 line 58 to Col. 3 line 4, Col. 3 lines 47-54, Col. 4 lines 24-33, Col. 4 line 65 to Col. 5 line 3, Col. 6 lines 21-29, Col. 6 lines 30-38, Col. 8 line 44 to Col. 9 line 28)

Kleinberg fail to clearly disclose, Internet objects is a transaction record.

It would have been obvious to on of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the method of searching using link object and the search of ecommerce data in order because it is well know in the art to search for items based on a price or linked to other items. (see Kleinberg, Col. 5 lines 20-25)

For claim 25, Kleinberg teaches, the inferred relation weighting process of claim 24 wherein said relevance score. (see Kleinberg, figures 1-5, Col. 2 line 58 to Col. 3 line 4, Col. 3 lines 47-54, Col. 4 lines 24-33, Col. 4 line 65 to Col. 5 line 3, Col. 6 lines 21-29, Col. 6 lines 30-38, Col. 8 line 44 to Col. 9 line 28)

Kleinberg fail to clearly disclose, relevance score is a percentage

It would have been obvious to on of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to represent the mathematical value of Kleinberg in the form of a percentage in order to represent the score in a manner familiar to the user. Official notice it taken.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See attached UPSTO 892 (if appropriate).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ajay M Bhatia whose telephone number is (571)-272-3906. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Valencia M Wallace can be reached on (571)-272-6159. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AB

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER